



Associated Students of the University of Washington
Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

1/12/2026

HUB 307

4:00 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P
Joseph Riggio (he/him), Vice Speaker | P
Julia Tanner (she/her), Public Relations Officer | P
TBD On-Campus Committee Chair | P
Abigail Appleyard (she/her), Off-Campus Committee Chair | P
Pierce Wallbaum (he/him), General Affairs Committee Chair | P
Dylan Bianchi (he/him), Academic & Administrative Affairs Committee Chair | P
Maitri Karia (she/her), GPSS Director of University Affairs | A
Nandana Jaideep (she/her), ASUW President | A
Ashwin Anand (he/him), Director of Internal Policy | A
Kate Lawson (she/her), Director of University Affairs | A
Jothsna Sundar (she/her), Senate Clerk | P
Brendan Chang (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Erick Jacobsen reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose

land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the Speaker's report, I just met with Khushi like an hour ago. And we talked about budget stuff so the Senate budget is being finalized. Good news, most of the things we want are probably going to happen. The one potential issue is I'm advocating for the pay rate for all Senate employees to be equal and because she has to check with SAO and Hub Finance to see if there's any like legal or procedural reason why that can't be the case. And then I would have to justify that to the Finance and Budget Committee in a deficit. But she said that it could be possible. And then we're working out other increases that rely more heavily on the general fund than the SAF allocation, so that we can keep the SAF allocation down and bring down the general fund as per the advice of SAF previously. So doing a lot of budget stuff. Also I'll say now the reason we are here today in McMahon is because the HUB is closed. There was some sort of leak that affected the electricals or something and it's closed and it may be closed tomorrow. So we will have to have a conversation when we approve the floor agenda about if we're canceling Senate or if Joseph can find a lecture hall that we can move to. Moving Meetings is not ideal even for like this small meeting. So we'll weigh all our options because there is stuff to get through and. We do have a meeting that will for sure be cancelled during Huskies on the Hill, so I don't want to bring down our amount of Senate Meetings any further if we don't have to. But those are some updates from me and I think that's all I have for you today. So we'll move on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hey y'all, so a couple things, Jothisna will probably say this, but due to there being a duplicate meeting and me accidentally not setting the permissions right for automatically transcribing and recording the floor, you'll notice that today there's only steering minutes. That's because we're using Jothisna's backup recording because there was never a recording for the teams meeting for that. There was a 2 1/2 hour recording of the two to three people that were in the autumn meeting, which is funny to me. But in terms of what happened on the floor and whatnot, we'll probably need help when the time comes just to really come through and verify the meeting from January 6th, just to make sure things look right. So that's why the delay is happening, It's my bad. The also as Erick pointed out, we're meeting here. Yay. I'm actively during this steering meeting going to try and find a lecture hall or someplace we can have a Senate tomorrow. But we can have that further discussion. Also, I did not get a chance to e-mail out, I'll probably do so later today. GAVEL applications are still open by 11:59 PM tomorrow is when they close. So please if you know people who are interested or you know people who would be good for GAVEL. Send them my way and send the application their way. And if you have any questions about that and what GAVEL does, I'll be happy to stick around and answer questions. Stick around for like a few minutes as we have back-to-back to back meetings, but I can answer quick questions. And that is all for me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Hello everyone. I just have two things. The first is on interns. I decided on interns. Congrats Pierce. We also have Luisa Grande and so the two of them will be our fun social media team. I'm excited to see what they come up with. So very exciting.

Applause requested by Erick Jacobsen

And then the second thing is we'll be discussing bonding for steering later in this meeting. But if you could be brainstorming what you'd like to do in the meantime, that would be great. I have some ideas already, but we'll discuss that more in length when we come to the discussion part and that's all I have, so have a good week.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Well, hi, present. Y'all are doing great. I don't have a word for the week for y'all. I'm sorry. But yeah, as Erick said, the building might not be open again tomorrow. They don't know. I think it really just depends, like, how well they're able to fix everything. I think we'll probably know more in the morning if it'll be able to be open for the day or not. Yeah, it was a water leak basically, how it was described to me, the water leak went on to an electrical panel and I think it like ruined the wiring and a lot of electrical of the building, like pieces blew out. So I think a lot of it is just like investigating and the building and whatnot. So yeah, we'll see, but anyways, have a great, yeah, y'all are doing great.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on them to the approval of the minutes.

Recess 4:07 pm

Reconvened 4:10 pm

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve the minutes

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on now to our first proposal of the day, we have Joint Resolution 32-2, a Joint Tri-Campus resolution to Improve Tri Campus Relations and joint efforts. The sponsor is Aiden Reeder, co-sponsored by Joseph. Aiden, do you want to get started on this for us?

Aiden Reeder: As a disclaimer real quick, tri-campus is used informally as the speaker is well aware of trying to make connections with the other senates, but it is still there for understanding the work and the sponsoring of other senators from the other senates that have that are on this legislation.

Aiden Reeder reads [JR-32-2 A Joint Tri-Campus Resolution to Improve Tri-Campus Relations and Joint Efforts](#)

Erick Jacobsen: So Aidan, do you want to either read the summary or summarize it yourself?

Aiden Reeder: Summarizing it myself briefly. Generally, from both my experience and experience of many others, collaboration tri-campus wise has been lacking. There's been severe lack of miscommunication, and I feel this was particularly highlighted last year. I remember going to Huskies on the Hill and being completely unprepared to actually talk to legislators. I, like legislators, I knew nothing of what they were sponsoring. I knew nothing. I was telling them, hey, you should sponsor a bill you started, which one is embarrassing and two is counterproductive and inefficient. So this is both an airing of grievances of what has happened and an explanation of why we're doing this. And then furthermore saying, hey, we need to establish some standards for collaboration, cooperation. This is how we should go about this.

Erick Jacobsen: Alright. Are there any questions?

Dylan Bianchi: Which if any members of Board or OGR did you consult when drafting this bill?

Joseph Riggio: So this is going to be the struggle for this bill. Especially because a lot of developments that have happened over the last year and a half have been sort of sources that have wanted keep themselves anonymous. To answer your question, we do have, there's, no, is the short answer to the question. The long answer to that question as to why is especially given this year legislative efforts, legislative reception, Huskies on the Hill. The some people who worked on this bill just want to remain anonymous.

Aiden Reeder: Can I follow up on that? Furthermore, this is out of previous experience with wanting to do reforms whenever Board has been involved or whenever Board has like, it's been either stalled or taken forever or been completely undone within a meeting beyond student input. And so this is in a sense, yes, trying to go around that, and I understand that does seem a bit sketchy but it's coming out of a place of concern for previous histories with this.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions?

Joseph Riggio: I know it's not a satisfying answer, but I don't mind giving a public testimony. So I worked at the state legislature last year, winter quarter, January 2025. And I was a Washington state intern, so I was not allowed to lobby with ASUW or anyone for that matter. I wasn't a government employee, but I can speak impartially on what I did notice. So I work for the Office of Senator Claire Wilson, 30th Legislative District. We have our office in the Legislative building and she is a very proud advocate of not just higher education, but K-12 education. And she is someone that you would want to connect with on some of the legislation that we advocate for, arguably on the legislative agenda. And there was supposed to be a meeting with Senator Claire Wilson. I helped Kit, the legislative assistant, book that meeting and confirmed with Sean, who was the Director of Legislative Affairs last year I would team him and we would regularly talk at the Capitol and then it

was a no show. And I followed up as to why and there were apparently some miscommunications. From my perspective, I wasn't really sure what was going on. I was just kind of poking fun at Sean being like, oh my god, even WSU showed up to meet with Senator Claire Wilson, like where are you guys at? And just from what I've overheard, I've confirmed with a few other senators from last year that apparently the experience was sort of the same that Huskies on the Hill last year to quite a few people felt like there was a lot of miscommunication that it wasn't what it could have been if there was more thoughtful and careful planning. So essentially a big part of this resolution and the timing of introducing it is before Huskies on the Hill to try and correct a lot of things and work together. So that way Huskies on the Hill this year can be really good. So that way we can work with Tacoma, we can work with Bothell, we can work with GPSS to make sure that all of our legislative efforts are going to be extra good this year, especially given state and federal concerns.

Dylan Bianchi: So I'm an intern for OGR. Huskies on the Hill planning is well underway. You describe a committee in the THAT clauses, which is, you know, like a formalized Huskies on the Hill committee. This essentially already exists. And is actively working to plan Huskies on the Hill. So again also I mean you're raising concerns about the like the planning last year and I think it's pretty clear that this bill is putting the onus on ASUW Seattle, which I think I think we all agree I think most people here were at Huskies on the Hill last year right? It was kind of a disaster. I think we could all agree on that. I think it's a mischaracterization to pin that primarily on ASUW Seattle, because other campuses were also responsible for planning elements of it. I'm not sure why ASUW Seattle is being pointed at as if ASUW Seattle's failure communicate was why this happened. And oh, and lastly, another thing that frustrates me is that in yeah, so THAT clause on line 33, "the BOD is thus implicated in OGR's failure to effectively lobby Olympia." So by saying OGR's failure as opposed to the failure of Sean Beal, you are referring to an entire department, an entire office of people and acting as if they were all failing to lobby in Olympia. I can tell you because I was interning in that office at the time. Brandon Elliott was working his ass off. He was working really hard. So OGR is now under the purview of Brandon Elliott. I don't think anyone here would deny that Huskies for Housing was a struggle. I don't think anyone here denied that Sean Beal was wildly incompetent. But these characterizations are personal. You called them an airing of grievances. I don't think that has any place on the Senate floor. I mean, I don't see how you can put forward a bill you you've just described as an airing of grievances and not bother to contact for comment the people who you are overtly criticizing in a bill. Yeah, I'm sorry. Come on.

Erick Jacobsen: I'd like to add that some of what Dylan said was advised to the sponsors by myself when I met with them in terms of contacting OGR contacting BOD and toning it down in terms of fall and focusing on solutions oriented and. There are like a couple things in here that I also know, like apart from the planning committee that are being planned to happen, but it is my understanding that the sponsors were hoping to ensure those things. So I don't know if that goes to that, but Aiden, you may respond.

Aiden Reeder: There's a couple of things that I can address here. I think the primary thing and I understand that the weights, the implications that grievances has. And I'm not going to lie necessarily. Some of this might be unfortunate. The primary reason of bringing these findings in making sure that senators this year know of this stuff is because of the fact that this isn't necessarily. This is indicative of the fact that if there is a bad actor, things can go downhill very fast, which means that things can be standardized beyond so that we're not just relying on good leadership. That we can rely on other structures and other committees that can be organized and have other people for accountability so that we're not just because I'm not going to lie, Brandon pulled through. He did great. He's doing what he needs to do. But unfortunately, he's not going to be here forever, and

there's going to be another time that there's going to be another Sean, which means that something needs to be set forward. I wasn't super aware that there was necessarily a planning committee with all of the, with ASUWB and ASUWT so fair if there is. But on that the the idea is that this is supposed to be putting safeguards in that that's what this is.

Joseph Riggio: Just to provide supplemental, I think some clarification what the 'THAT' clause is doing. I do understand that there is that I actually was aware that there was a committee on this and I was advising the people who were creating this bill on that, they are aware but what this is drafting is a memorandum of understanding by ASUW, ASUWB, ASUWT, GPSS as co equals. So right now the current committee is spearheaded by the ASUW Seattle Board of Directors which as we've kind of alluded to in this resolution, or at least some of the sponsors of this resolution have some issues with that, just from how historically legislative efforts have gone in the past. And again, I want to reiterate. Yeah, from my experience with Brandon, especially from last year, I was super stoked to hear when he was taking over as DOLA. We've had our ups and downs a little bit through GAVEL committee and whatnot, but overall I think he's really fit to take on the legislative session and that's not the point of this. The the point as Aiden was mentioning is that there are some structural improvements. We could work on our collaboration efforts, tri-campus, this is a way to do that. This is a way to create not just a promise of doing that necessarily, but a written contract of sorts that all of us would equally participate and it would be a joint effort. It wouldn't be led by any one organization, be led by all of us. And just to part of that committee, what they would do is sort of reassess, take a moment to step back because from my understanding the Huskies on the Hill planning committee is reactive to the current legislative session. Sure you might. I don't know what goes on in that committee, so I don't know if we're thinking far out or not, but this committee would think far out. This committee would think, okay, how could we organize ourselves in a way structurally to try and make it so that students have we have the greatest impact on students in a positive way.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll call for hands.

Dylan Bianchi: Why not just have this bill implement structural solutions? Why form another committee? Like if there's structural solutions that you guys see that need to be made, why not just put this in the bill?

Aiden Reeder: This. So the idea is that again, this is a joint resolution. It's not a Senate bill or whatever. So it's things we can suggest to Board and part of that is again this involves the symbolism of it being joint tri-campus. We understand that it doesn't necessarily have a complete binding power. We just want the opinion of this to be known and say like things were badly done and we don't want to rely on the promise that there will be someone who won't do that again. I do on one of your previous points. I do find it interesting and I have heard this from others that ASUWT and ASUWB have maybe not done their fair share in the work of doing stuff and so perhaps that could absolutely be included in a WHEREAS clause if we can find like express evidence of that beyond testimony. I think that would be a fair fair point to show hey, the burden is shared. This is an issue not just with one but with all and that a shared standard MOU would be a step towards fixing this.

Erick Jacobsen: Anyone else have any comments or questions or responses?

Dylan Bianchi: I think you might have misunderstood my question. I understand it's a resolution. My question is why in this resolution are you suggesting a committee instead of suggesting this like the specific changes to the bylaws or whatever you want to make?

Joseph Riggio: Because this isn't something that can be fixed by bylaws every, ASUWT, ASUWB, GPSS, they're all independent and they create their own bylaws and governing documents. They have their own constitutions and whatnot. So the point of this is that this joint resolution doesn't have that, you know, binding power that a Senate bill does to create to create language. You're absolutely correct in that. But the reason for that is because we can't really tell another organization what to do. So we can have our own internal disputes about cooperation and collaboration and whatnot. And there actually is a Senate bill that might address that. But in terms of us making a promise and unifying and agreeing to abide by a contract that we all signed saying, hey, this is how we should move forward. The way that these the sponsors wanted to symbolically do it was through a joint resolution. So that is the path they took to establish a committee for that memorandum of understanding contract. That's why we're not integrating it into like ASUW bylaws.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions or comments?

Dylan Bianchi: Maybe I phrased that poorly. Like again, I understand this can't change anything. Obviously in mobile campuses like we can't pass a bill that changes ASUWT bylaws or anything, but the civic specific proposals here are to create new meetings, new committees, essentially create new processes to make change. So I'm confused because it seems that you guys have specific ideas of what you'd like to see change within how ASUWT and ASUW Seattle's relationship works. What are those changes and why not include them in a bill? This is just to clarify on this. Are you meaning like we specify who is on I guess the representatives for ASUW and what not set in bylaws? Is that what you're? Trying to get at, I'm so my understanding of the bill is that you'd be forming. OK, we have this problem right of a of communication. You'd be forming a committee to solve the problem. Like the committee would figure out how to solve the problem.

Aiden Reeder: This is just to clarify on this. Are you meaning like we specify who is on I guess the representatives for ASUW and what not set in bylaws? Is that what you're trying to get at?

Dylan Bianchi: My understanding of the bill is that you'd be forming. OK, we have this problem right, of communication. You'd be forming a committee to solve the problem. Like the committee would figure out how to solve the problem.

Aiden Reeder: No this is solving the problem. The committee isn't to figure out how to solve the problem is that this would be an outline way to establish a direct path of communication that on on the event it's not we're we're trying to figure it's not we're making a committee to figure out bylaws do all that stuff is that this committee will figure out how to run the event as we all work together. But that's the intent.

Joseph Riggio: I'm happy to if we want to, instead of qualifying it to Huskies on the Hill, I'm happy that when this hits the floor and whatnot and we can talk about this Aiden, but just to make this about collaboration efforts generally and this committee is not just about Huskies on the Hill if that is your concern, because there's already a committee about that specific issue. I mean, yeah, this is, trying to find my words because this is a legal gray area. This trying to resolution is basically us signing on and saying yeah, we agree to collaborate with each other and do it in this way. And as Aiden said, that is the catalyst as the pathway to possibly in the future like a commit like you're what you are alluding to or from my understanding what you're alluding to is like enshrining this in some sort of structured policy way where it actually does something. Well, that yes, that can come after, but first things first, we all need to agree to do it.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments? Any questions, comments or motions? I will ask the sponsors, I'm aware that your intention is for the strong resolution and the succeeding Senate bill to be read in the Select Committee created by the Organic Act that has not yet been passed.

Aiden Reeder: No not anymore. we feel that it could go into a committee deigned by steering if they deign to pass it.

Joseph Riggio: The joint resolution was never intended to go to the Select Committee the. The only the as the Organic Act reads right now, it's only for constitutional amendments. So It was just anticipated that it would be for the constitutional amendment, not other Senate bills at this time.

Erick Jacobsen: Well then I'll ask again are there any questions, comments, or motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to table JR-32-2 for a week

Julia Tanner seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Dylan Bianchi: To be blunt, I don't think this is a resolution that's fit for the Senate floor. I think it's polemic. Aiden you described it as an airing of grievances. I think the most tangible THAT clause it has in it establishes a committee that already exists. And so I think it is, I'm gonna be really blunt. It is insubstantial THAT clauses attached to WHEREAS clauses that pretty pointedly point fingers and pointing fingers in a way that is not informed, points fingers at people that you guys did not talk to. So I don't want to put this before senate.

Joseph Riggio: This is a procedural argument because I respect that argument. We're a steering committee for putting things on the agenda. We're not the arbiters of whether or not a bill is heard on the floor. Therefore I say we don't have legislation, guys. If senators feel the same way Dylan does on the floor, so be it. We should put this on the agenda.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll clarify that we technically are the arbiters of what goes on the Senate floor because we do have the power to reject resolutions and we have in the past on the basis of either not being well written and or well researched. I think that's just the main one, but I'd say if we're considering leaving this up to senators, we would have to make sure that senators sort of know what they're arguing and voting on, which would be difficult to do because the procedure would be for it to go straight to a committee. And then even if we say bring it to that committee and brief that committee, I'm not sure if I mean, I guess they'd be able to table it indefinitely, but it'd probably be preferred that the floor discuss it and at that point It'd have to go through committee. So at that point I'm not sure if if our concern is that we should not be having the discussion about whether or not to present this to the floor now. I think we should think about what the other option is because I think that would be difficult, but. That's not to say that this isn't a conversation that we can't have. But with that, we are now in a period of open debate.

Dylan Bianchi: The reason I said tables for weak is because I do think it's not necessarily necessary to toss this out of hand entirely. I'd agree that there's definitely friction in cross campus communication. But I for at least one case, the case being that they're trying to establish a Huskies on the Hill committee, there are factual inaccuracies in the bill and I think there's also key people who are missing. So I think maybe it'd be best. If the sponsors continue developing the bill and that in its present state, it's not in his ideal form to be presented to senate.

Joseph Riggio: In that case, this is again a procedural argument. I'm not sure, Erick, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but it's been introduced now and if we table it and whatnot, I mean we can't make amendments to it. We can do research and whatnot, yes, and I personally do plan on speaking to OGR. I've been, I've taken on an advisor and legal advisor role for this. I've been encouraging people to do things. I'm more than happy to have conversations with OGR and I'm sure Aiden you'd like to join too. And we can still. We can still put it on the floor as that research is happening. I don't see why that can't be the case. We've had bills that have stayed in committees for a long period of time just as research is going on, because that way the committee can make those edits as research is coming up. And I'd rather it be tabled in committee than tabled and senators not even knowing that this is happening.

Erick Jacobsen: Speaking to that procedural point and taking the more historical lens, the way we've dealt with similar situations before is either. Sponsors withdraw their bill and submit a new version with all the amendments they'd like, or sponsors prepare committee edits before it goes into committee. And that's a factor that CRN takes into account, and then that's something that's discussed and then. Voted upon in committee. So if Dylan's motion say passes on the table for a week and you all prepare amendments and it goes through, then those amendments would still be able to be voted upon in committee but. Again, that's just a procedural response. I don't necessarily have a recommendation for you all because I think this is something that comes down entirely to opinion, and I want to respect and enable all of your opinions.

Joseph Riggio: I want to yield my time to Aiden just to hear what they have to comment.

Aiden Reeder: Thank you, I can understand why this would be polarizing. And perhaps as it is, it's not ready for the Senate floor. I think that there is still a possibility for not only for the amendments put forth by chairs here to actually take effect and be put through in committee, but in the way that it is right now, before any committee amendments getting made as well as after that, then the committee like a floor of senators can also do that. So that can also be another source of information for what this resolution can go through.

Joseph Riggio: The last thing I'll mention, this isn't a reason to table it or not table it and whatnot. But I do point it out there that we will have people coming to testify about this bill that will provide senators a lot of insight, some of whom are on the planning committee right now so, or the Huskies on the Hill planning committee. So if you are worried about that and those conversations not happening, those conversations are going to happen. So I am aware of that. I did just get confirmation that they're confirmed. So again, I just want to point that out there as a point of information.

Erick Jacobsen: We are still in a period of open debate.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to the previous question

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Motion to table JR 32-2 for 1 week approved 1-0-4

Erick Jacobsen: Moving forward to SB-32-2 Senate Bill for Institutional Reform.

Joseph Riggio: Given that the joint resolution has been tabled, I would recommend also moving to table this. I'm not going to table because I'm the sponsor.

Julia Tanner moves to table SB-32-2 for one week.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: We are moving on to the approval of the Senate floor agenda and we've received word that the HUB will be open tomorrow.

Joseph Riggio: Hallelujah

Erick Jacobsen: So with that in mind, just run through the agenda real quick. We do have a SAF forum which appears to have a link where you can edit. Or a link where I can edit at least. OK, no, I'm just an editor. My bad. We have a SAF forum from Haley and Aiden and then we have on campus Committee Chair elections and a graduate transfer committee. No new business, we can talk about tabling, not having committee meetings or skipping past committee meetings if we'd like, but that's not necessarily something we have to do. It's just something that we're all capable of proposing. But with that in mind, are there any questions, comments or motions on this agenda?

Dylan Bianchi moves to remove committee meetings from the agenda

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Julia Tanner objects

Dylan Bianchi yields

Julia Tanner: I know, I'm not a committee chair technically, but as a past committee chair, I do think that committee meetings, even if it's like a 5 minute meeting to just check in with your committee members and like plan bonding, I think is valuable. So I'm gonna say like keep it, but put a cap for 5 minutes on it.

Julia Tanner withdraws objection

Fails 1-3-1

Dylan Bianchi moves to add a 5 minute timestamp

Julia Tanner seconds

Kavi Pasupathi objects

Dylan Bianchi yields

Kavi Pasupathi: I'm just saying attendance itself takes around like 3 to 5 minutes itself. So we're just going to go and take attendance and then come back. So it doesn't really seem like an effective use of us getting out of our chairs, coming back.

Julia Tanner: And correct me if this is wrong, but I don't think you have to take attendance in committees if there's no business.

Erick Jacobsen: We'd like you to. We'd certainly like you to. Yeah, I would certainly prefer that so that we can supplement. Joseph's records in case anyone misses the attendance vote. We're still in a period of open debate.

Dylan Bianchi: I hadn't considered this and I do think Kavi's right. Given that our last two committee meetings were also just check ins, it might be today that a check in style meeting today isn't going to achieve much and we'll just get out there, take attendance and just leave.

Dylan Bianchi withdraws motion to add five minute timestamp.

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and swap old business item order.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 3-0-2

Kavi Pasupathi moves to suspend the rules and remove committee meetings.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 3-2-1

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: With that, we'll move on to discussion. So for spring and future steering times, like I said last week, I just wanted to make space for this every week in case we have any insight or anything we want to add. Is there?

Jothsna Sundar: I agree with a lot of what was said last week, but I do think that like the best time is more or less an empirical question based off of when the least classes are scheduled in the time schedule and the other things that we need of like it has to be before, the agenda has to be posted before 5 before Senate. So I'm willing to go through at least one of the old time schedules and visualize the distribution of classes before, I'm not gonna say next meeting because that's not happening. Two Meetings from now. Like we can go over it again then, just because I feel like we're going about this with a like a lack of information and we don't need to.

Erick Jacobsen: I think that's a great point and I would really appreciate that. Any other thoughts on future times?

Pierce Wallbaum: I would say I think that's a good idea. I think it's pretty fair if overall we meet when there's less likely to be a class. It seems pretty fair to me.

Dylan Bianchi: I just think Jothsna's comments were very insightful and I applaud her taking the initiative to do this work for all our benefits.

Erick Jacobsen: With that, we'll move on to Provost forum questions. Joseph, take it away.

Joseph Riggio: Hey, y'all. So we have the Provost coming on the 27th. Hopefully the HUB doesn't have another catastrophic week. We are prepared for the Provost to come, and part of that is like last time I have not had time to generate questions to bring forward today. I've been working hard on graduate school apps among a million other things, so I apologize, but yeah, I just wanted to take some time out of steering today to talk a little bit about what kind of questions y'all want to propose. These would be the questions that be submitted to the provost's office for comment. So that way they can prepare ahead of time and provide a thorough response. So these should be pretty general sweeping questions that cover a number of different things. We want to give a lot more time this time to senators, senator questions through the moderated Q&A. So this time we're asking questions to be limited to three to five from us. So with that I'm happy I have my notepad here. I'm happy or actually well we can write them down as we go. I guess let me just switch to review mode. But yeah, reminder of what the provost does. So just generally the Office of the Provost is let me pull up the website so I have accurate information, but they handle a lot more of the academic and departmental side of things like capacity constrained would actually be something good to ask and then the president already mentioned it, but you know we wanted a follow up question we could because that would be something she would be involved with. Let's see. And then Provost's office, yeah so I mean they they also are connected with a lot of faculty members and whatnot. Provost has a newsletter with stuff that they do too. So I think actually this Wednesday they they might be releasing their newsletter. So I would encourage looking at that. You don't have to decide on questions today necessarily, but I do want to get some ideas going so that way we can send them hopefully the next week at the very latest.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll just add officially, Provost is the university's academic and budget officer so if that helps.

Pierce Wallbaum: So for clarification would the provost fall under, would their responsibilities fall under like the budget cuts with academic advising departments and all that sort of problem.

Erick Jacobsen: I believe so to a certain extent. Part of it is like the College of Arts and Sciences budget itself, but yeah, I wish I had my notebook today. I left it in my apartment. But I went to a PACS meeting, Provost Advisory Committee for Students, and I asked about the College of Arts and Sciences cuts. And I can share in the steering chat what she said about that. But. That's another thing to keep in mind is if we keep little questions, I mean that's a big question, but if if we want, we don't need to be afraid of not getting to everything because we will still have PACS, which is a direct Line to her, so. But that is something that I do believe we could ask about if you want to.

Maitri Karia: Will you be attending the PACS meeting on Wednesday?

Erick Jacobsen: I went to one like last quarter I think.

Maitri Karia: So like it's happening this Wednesday so I was wondering how is it different.

Erick Jacobsen: She's coming to the Senate to give a forum, yeah. So we'll be able to ask her questions directly and senators will be able to ask her questions directly because like Pax is like, I think it's still technically open, but it's like a smaller room. It's more difficult to get as many people there. So it's mainly a place for senators to have a direct Line to her without an intermediary. Are there any other question ideas? And if we don't come up with three to five, Joseph and I can work on figuring that out as well.

Dylan Bianchi: Is the Provost connected to the whole College of Engineering thing with the fee?

Erick Jacobsen: In a sense, I did ask her about that at the PACS meeting as well, and she said that they were implementing new policies to deal with things like that. We can ask for more specifics if we'd like.

Pierce Wallbaum: Can you remind us when she's coming?

Joseph Riggio: January 27th her speaking time is 5:15

Dylan Bianchi: When do we need to have question suggestions in by?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, good question. So there really isn't a date because all the actual event materials are submitted that are required for the event, however, to give them enough time to. Adequately respond or their office to. I would say we need to give them a week, so no later than after our steering meeting or no later than the 20th end of the day.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other ideas?

Joseph Riggio: We will have a special meeting, special steering meeting this Friday, by the way.

Erick Jacobsen: If there's no other comments on that, we'll move on to steering bonding!

Julia Tanner: OK, yeah, so some ideas that I was having for steering, I want to kind of talk about ideas of stuff we want to do first in this meeting and then I'll send out a when to meet of like week and then like week ideas, what week we want to do it and then what our weeks kind of look like in terms of when we're free. So we could do kind of what we did last time since not everyone was able to go. For like game night or snacks and snacks. Or we could do like a presentation night or like a paint and sip, which I really want to do eventually. Or yeah, or we could like get together and like bake cookies. Or like just do a potluck and get together and talk kind of thing. Or go out to Boba. Anyway, so those are just my ideas. I kind of want to hear like if any of those really spark your interest as something you want to do or if there's something better or something else that you'd like to do and I'll write them down.

Pierce Wallbaum: I really liked the game night last quarter. I thought that was pretty fun when we brought snacks and

Erick Jacobsen: I wasn't there 😞

Dylan Bianchi: I just think the potluck model is good. Whether its like snacks like last time or we actually make like dinner foods.

Commented [JC1]: I know this needs to be deleted I just wanted to have some fun 😞

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the announcements and public comment period. Are there any announcements or would any member of the public like to speak to steering?

Maitri Karia: I have a comment. A lot of people have been reaching out to me regarding ASUW positions that are open on Handshake. I don't know if you want to put, I think it's from September onwards from the 26th. They want to like put out more information about it explaining. The main questions I'm getting and I don't know why I'm getting, but it's about the application is about the recruitment process and yeah, it's just a lot of talk going around about it because suddenly there are so many open positions.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah so I'll go into a brief explanation of ASUW hiring. So positions are open in waves. So this is the first wave. It's all of the office coordinators, EAC and our wonderful Senate Clerk's position. The positions do start in autumn. They're year long. They're just open now and then any student can apply undergraduate or graduate to any of these positions and they will be, submitted resume and responses. Those will be reviewed. Two or more people will be selected for an interview, and then one of those interviewed applicants will be hired by the Board of Directors. So it's open to all students. I believe all of the duties will be in all of those. But yeah, all, every, yeah. And I think the pay and the hours should be as well. Some of those information, that information might change and if so, I'll keep you all up to date because I'm working on our budget packet for next year. But every hired ASUW position will be open between now and the end of spring quarter. So this is the first wave, but there will be a lot more. So if anyone coming to you says maybe this, you can let them know that there will be more and different things. So yeah, but any student can apply.

Maitri Karia: OK and can they come and attend the Senate meetings to understand more about ASUW?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, of course, absolutely. Are there any other announcements or public comments?

Joseph Riggio: Student Health Fee. Oh my gosh. When, I'm not doing my vice speaker stuff, I'm doing Health Fee stuff. Wow. So guys, we have a lot of positive feedback from departments and advisors being like we want to advertise this survey. Problem is, the original closing date was January 19th and we are still. 30% away from a representative sample for undergrad. So and also the Provost has even requested a little bit more time so that they can advertise things as well. So we had extensive conversation with the health units and I confirmed with the student planning committee today for the Student Health Fee. Congratulations everyone. The health fee survey is extended February 4th. So if people have not filled it out, tell them to fill it out. Tell five people to fill it out who haven't filled it out and that would be, whoa, amazing. That'd be so good. That'd be so good. That's like 50 people. That's great. So also if you want to help with survey promotion efforts, it's kind of like a get out to vote effort. You can come talk to me. I'm happy to provide you resources to ask your faculty about lecture announcements where you maybe you've seen me in different lectures. If you haven't, I you probably will in the next few weeks, depending on which faculty allows me to give a lecture presentation. But if you want to help out too, please reach out to me. Or if you know people who want to help out as well, send them my way and I will add them to the committee chat. Thank you.

Julia Tanner: this is just adding on to that. I'm going to be designing and posting another post for the Student Health Bee in the ASUW Student Senate. When you see that posted, if you could repost your story, that would be awesome. But if it's really against your aesthetic, I totally understand and no questions.

Erick Jacobsen: Joseph, I wanted to ask, is the health fee still on a timeline where the joint resolution is hoping to be submitted this quarter?

Joseph Riggio: Yes

Erick Jacobsen: OK. Any other announcements or public comments? Are there any motions?

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Dylan Bianchi withdraws motion

Pierce Wallbaum moves to adjourn

Approved 3-0-2

5:09

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate

Commented [JC2]: because Erick Jacobsen was being
persnickety